

# Chapter 12

## Summary of Schemes; Recommendation

*Three options(schemes) have been developed as possible ways of addressing the proposed gymnasium addition at the Takoma Park Community Center. Two of the options locate the gym addition to the northeast of the existing building, where it was originally proposed as part of the initial design in the Mandatory Referral. The third option locates the gym addition behind the center, to the northwest. The following is a brief summary analysis of each option (scheme) from a programmatic view only. The cost estimates, with various alternates, should be reviewed separately for each scheme. [e.g. what is or is not included, Green roof or no Green roof, Victorian roof embellishments or not, etc...]*

### SCHEME 1.5

This option provides a properly sized gymnasium, with a full size (50'x 84') main court, two smaller cross courts, and retractable bleacher seating for approximately 200. The lockers and restrooms are properly sized, and are appropriately located, relative to the other functions. The office is properly sized, and appropriately located near the main entry, with supervision into the gym. A corridor between the new gym and the existing building provides continued access as well as exit egress for the other community center functions. However, due to the restrictive building footprint, based on existing conditions (location of existing doors, etc.) and structural issues, the remaining program elements are undersized and not optimally located. Storage is in excess of the desired program area, but must be placed in three separate locations. The fitness room is grossly undersized – 700 nsf versus the programmed 2000 nsf. However, an existing wall with windows now has a view to a waiting area and an interior corridor (w/ skylights if possible). The location of the building requires that the existing utilities be addressed. The Sch. 1.5 option requires the most extensive utility relocating out of all the schemes. Also, this scheme is able to accommodate an additional area of 1650 nsf to the Public Safety Level 1 for police lock-up and storage areas.

#### [ Alternate b support space area for Sch 1.5

This support space layout uses the identical footprint and gym layout of Scheme 1.5. However, the floor plan layout of the support spaces is reconfigured to show a possible solution to the insufficiently sized fitness space in the Scheme 1.5 support space layout. This is an alternate, produced in order to show that with further development, the issue of the undersized fitness area could be resolved, but is beyond the current scope of this study. The fitness room is still undersized at 1,500 nsf versus the programmed 2000 nsf, but is much closer to the programmed size than the 700 nsf of Sch 1.5. The extent of the existing plaza impacts the design]

### SCHEME 1.6

This option provides an undersized gym, based on the program. The gym is approximately the same size as the nearby Piney Branch ES gym. The main court is undersized for competition play. There are inadequate cross-court provisions. The retractable bleachers provide seating for approximately 150, 50 below the programmed size. The end and side run-outs are also inadequate. All of the other spaces are well below the programmed sizes, or are non-existent. The locker rooms are at the programmed size as well as the toilet rooms, barely. The storage areas are well undersized. The office and fitness room are not provided. In addition, the location of the building requires that the existing utilities be addressed. This scheme also does not provide additional area at Public Safety Level 1 for police lock-up and storage areas

This scheme 1.6 has a significant issue--- *the utilities remaining in place as was previously discussed in Chapter 8.* Even ignoring the estimated construction cost of building over the utilities (i.e. the proposed solution in dealing with the existing utilities which is to create a

structural system that allows building over the utilities with the assumption that the appropriate easements can be granted) the requirements for future access to those utilities with this scheme is a major problem. Even if easements could be granted or negotiated from all the utility companies (Pepco, WSSC, etc.) including the City of Takoma Park for its own storm water system, the problems inherent in dealing with a utility failure, leak or some other maintenance issue will impact the operations of the gym, require the removal and demolition of portions of the gym exterior walls and removal of the gym flooring, the gym concrete sub floor, as well as excavation and then pay again for their reconstruction. It also raises issues of liability to adjacent properties for utility disruption. Regardless of the estimated cost of building over the utilities, **we do not recommend this Scheme 1.6.**

### SCHEME 3.2

This option meets the proposed space program. All spaces are basically provided at their programmed size and quantity. All spaces are appropriately located relative to each other, for optimal functional efficiency. This scheme, with the additional underground parking spaces proposed, is also able to accommodate an additional area of 1650 nsf to the Public Safety Level 1 for police lock-up and storage areas. However, by locating this option behind the existing building, a few potentially challenging site issues are created. These include reduced parking on site (-7 spaces), increased visual issues for the neighbors to the back, and the need to provide vehicle circulation around the back of the gym by using retaining walls to alter the grade.

### CONCLUSION

From a **programming** standpoint, only Option 3.2 basically addresses the entire proposed program. Additionally, it requires the least amount of disturbance to the existing utilities. However, depending on the impact this location has on the site and the neighbors, this option may not be the best. Scheme 1.5, for example, is the best option of the two that locate the gym to the northeast. It offers the properly sized gym, provides most of the programmed spaces, and provides continued access for the Police without changing the existing rear buffer area as much. Option 1.6 is the least preferred option. It does not provide the proper program, and still requires that the existing utilities be addressed. Therefore, in order of preference from a **programming** standpoint, the schemes are 3.2, 1.5 and 1.6.

Below is a comparison of the spaces provided by each scheme, in relation to the programmed spaces:

<u>SPACE:</u>	<u>Program nsf:</u>	<u>SCH. 1.5</u>	<u>SCH. 1.6</u>	<u>SCH. 3.2</u>
Gymnasium				
Main Court Area	4,200	4,200	2,950	4,200
Run-outs	2,100	2,100	1,650	2,100
Bleachers	1,000	1,000	700	1,000
Misc.	500	500	100	500
Subtotal	7,800	7,800	5,400	7,800
Women's Lockers	300	350	300	300
Men's Lockers	300	350	300	300
Women's Toilet	300	300	300	300
Men's Toilet	300	300	300	300
Office	100	100	0	100
Storage	400	850	100	400
Fitness Room	2,000	700	0	2,000
Misc. & circulation	2,000	2,750	400	2,000
Subtotal	5,700	5,700	1,700	5,700
<b>TOTAL (nsf)</b>	<b>13,500</b>	<b>13,500</b>	<b>7,100</b>	<b>13,500</b>